

United States Patent and Trademark Office

CNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Brc. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/936,111	01/16/2002	Gianni Collina	US 18026	9340
7590 07/09/2004		EXAMINER		
Joanne W Patterson			LU, C CAIXIA	
Bassel North America Inc 912 Appleton Road			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Elkton, MD 21921			1713	
			DATE MAILED: 07/09/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
•	09/936,111	COLLINA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Caixia Lu	1713				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app		orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 M	ay 2004.					
<u> </u>						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	•	• •				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		• •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 09/936,111

Art Unit: 1713

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaughan et al. (WO 97/48736) in view of Sacchetti et al. (US 5,759,940) for the same rationale as set forth in the previous Office action mailed on Nov. 5, 2003.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed May 5, 2004 have been fully considered. The objection and rejections under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph are withdrawn in view of applicants amendments; however, the rejections under 35 USC 103 of the record are maintained.

Applicants argue that Vaughan refers to the use of late transition metal catalysts as catalyst components supported on silica and is silent about the drawbacks of silica support and does not furnish any incentive to overcome the drawback by supporting these catalyst components on a porous olefinic polymer. While it is true that Vaughan does not recognize the advantage of a porous olefinic polymer support over the silica support, such an advantage is known at the time of applicants' invention and is taught in Sacchetti. Sacchetti recognizes that the use of a support tends to lower the activity of catalyst considerably (col. 2, line 8-9) and, thus, expressly teach a porous olefinic polymer as support for transition metal metallocene complex to provide catalysts with high activities and controlled morphologies (col. 3, lines 9-12). Thus, one would have been motivated to use the porous olefinic polymer support of Sacchetti to Vaughan's

Application/Control Number: 09/936,111

Art Unit: 1713

þ

catalyst composition in searching for improved activity and morphology for the catalysts. Incentive does exist.

Regarding the applicants' comparative results, it is the examiner's position that gas phase polymerization process is not considered in any circumstance to be identical to a slurry polymerization, thus, the comparison of applicants' Example 1 and Comparative Example 2 cannot provide much insight for showing criticality and unexpected results.

Mr. Gianni Collina's declaration under rule 132 filed on May 6, 2004 is noted. The declaration states that the polymerization kinetics is not affected by the difference between Example 1 and Comparative Example 2. However, the declaration does not provide any evidence to show that the only difference between Example 1 and Comparative Example 2 is the support. Because there is no proof of any kinds on the record to show when the silica support of Comparative Example 2 is replace by the polyolefin support of Example 1, the polymer the polymer resulted will be identical to the polymer of Example, the burden of showing of criticality and unexpected results is not met by the applicants.

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

Application/Control Number: 09/936,111

Art Unit: 1713

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Caixia Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1106. The examiner can normally be reached from 9:00 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful and the matter is urgent, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached at (571) 272-1114. The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1700.

Caixia Lu, Ph. D. Primary Examiner July 2, 2004

(disting the